

233 South Wacker Drive Suite 800, Sears Tower Chicago, IL 60606

312-454-0400 (voice) 312-454-0411 (fax) www.chicagoareaplanning.org

Environment and Natural Resources Committee DRAFT Minutes

April 2, 2008-9:30 a.m.

Members Present: Patricia Young and Joe Schuessler (*alternate*) – Metropolitan Water

Reclamation District of Greater Chicago, John Oldenburg

(alternate) – Chicago Wilderness, Patty Werner (alternate) - Lake County SMC, Cynthia Skrukrud (alternate) – Sierra Club, Karla Kramer – U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Ingrid Ruttendjie – Fox Waterway Agency, Lynn Boerman – IDNR Region 2 Ecosystem Partnerships, Kama Dobbs – DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference, Marty Jaffe – University of Illinois at Chicago, Wally Van Buren – Illinois Association of Wastewater Agencies, Mel Nickerson (alternate) – Environmental Law & Policy Center, Patrick Ryan – Village of Berwyn, Harlan Spiroff – Villages of Wayne, Elmhurst & Oak Brook Terrace, Kate Agasie (alternate) – Metropolitan Mayors

Caucus, Amy Walkenbach - IEPA Bureau of Water

Staff Present: Kerry Leigh, Hala Ahmed, Joy Schaad, Drew Williams Clark,

Dawn Thompson, Julia Krakenbuhle, Lori Heringa, Don Kopec,

Others Present: Paul Heltne and Brook Hecht - Center for Humans and Nature,

Mike Klemens, Will County Government League

1.0 Call to Order

Ingrid called the meeting to order at 9:32 am.

2.0 Agenda Changes and Announcements

Ingrid is acting chair as Jack is unable to attend. Welcome of new committee members Harlan Spiroff, Patrick Ryan, Mel Nickerson, and Martha Dooley. Notice of the Linking Watersheds Conference on April 22nd www. foxriverecosystem.org

3.0 Approval of Minutes from March 5, 2008

Change Patricia Young to Patty Werner on page two. Cindy Skrukrud moved to approve seconded by John Oldenburg with changes as noted. Motion carried.

Environment and Natural Resources Committee Minutes-April 2nd, 2008

- 4.0 Report Back on Planning Coordinating Committee Vice-Chair Ingrid Ruttendjie
 The CMAP working committee chairs and vice chairs sit on the planning and
 programming coordinating committees. The March 12th minutes are on the web. One
 item of note was a presentation under the regional vision development agenda item.
 There was a speaker from trucking and freight who advocated for freight to be an item
 on all of the working committees as trucking issues touch all our committees. Ingrid
 requested Kerry to add this item to the list for future meetings to brief the committee on
 freight issues. John asked to include rail and barge freight as well as many here are
 concerned about the CN proposal with relevance around the region and how freight
 movement affects our waterways. The discussion indicated that the committee wanted
 to look at freight comprehensively and regionally.
- 5.0 GO TO 2040 Indicators Development Andrew Williams-Clark, CMAP staff
 Andrew provided a recap of the regional indicators project mapping out the goals for
 where we want the region to be noting that the indicators are the measure of our
 achievements. CMAP has engaged URS Corp. John Powers who will be working
 exclusively on research for the environmental indicators. The first benchmark will be
 presented at the next meeting of this committee. The committee will be able to see an
 evaluation on how the indicators will be operationalized. Andrew handed out a list of
 the environmental indicators so far that the committee has worked on.

Andrew asked the committee if they noticed any gaps, reframing or comments they would like to offer. The sensitivity of watersheds was brought up and there was a discussion on how that would be operationalized. Market sensitivity of amenities was suggested, and a discussion of how this would be operationalized ensued. Marty asked if indications are aggregated only on a regional level and what would we measure and is there data available for meaningful measurements? Andrew answered that we will take whatever level of data is available, be it regional, county, or block level, and we are going for the maximum level of detail. Marty asked if it was a snapshot or tracked over time. Andrew said that we prefer data that extends as far into the past as possible and is updated most frequently. He will report on this at the next committee meeting. Marty asked if the data will be used for long term land use and transportation planning or short term projects. Andrew answered that it will be used for both.

Patty Werner asked about structuring this list as combining watershed planning and stewardship might not work and some items under watershed planning may not be relevant. Patty will help Andrew with a shopping list based from data SMC collects. Paul Heltne asked if there was a more comprehensive list? Andrew said that there is a comprehensive list and he will make that available on the web. Andrew added health indicators as this is also within the purview of this committee. He will cross reference those vision themes to this committee as appropriate and have them reviewed by the

committees. Ingrid said that the committee members could assist by giving data sources and references to the consultant.

John noted that these indicators have to be truly measureable and fit into the scenario modeling. We would have to have various discussions with other committees and he asked if that was possible. Drew responded that this measure manifests itself in many ways to many users and that we will have a warehouse of environmental data that will have different statistical validity. Therefore, a comprehensive list is best. He added that we will have a web site that will allow people to download the data and use it. Scenario planning, statistical validity, and a precedent for modeling, will all be limiting to some degree, however the data filtering process, the data warehouse and website can all be used in the modeling process. John said that, given those restrictors as to what is applicable to the scenario modeling, we, as a committee, need to really understand the prioritization relative to this use. We need to really identify key indicators that would be the spread and want to make sure there is good representation as well as understand the gaps to get those missing data sets. Andrew added that this process will identify the gaps too, and he will be engaging the committee in this effort.

Cindy asked if model ordinances were viewed as being under watershed planning as they are key indicators of environmental stewardship. Andrew said he can break these out by categories. What can the committee look at to see what these indicators are addressing? Andrew directed the committee to: www.goto2040.net

Mel asked about water quality and environmental toxicity, and if that would include industrial pollution, especially as it pertains to Lake Michigan. He would like to see it broken out by type: industrial, commercial, residential, municipal, etc. Drew replied yes. Andrew can be contacted at awilliamsClark@cmap.illinois.gov

6.0 Facilities Planning Areas Update – Dawn Thompson, CMAP staff
Dawn gave a brief background of the FPA process in the region and the current
committee structure. The last time she was before this committee she submitted a draft
document for the committee to provide comments. This was reviewed by the CMAP
board and the board accepted both the short and long term recommendations. An
immediate goal is that Kendall county be included in the designated planning area for
areawide planning agency jurisdiction.

In terms of the wastewater committee actions, it has met four times and considered 12 applications for boundary changes and plant expansions. Boundary agreements continue to be an ongoing issue. The committee has not yet expressed a preference about how to deal with the adoption of ordinances before sending their recommendation to IEPA. What direction this committee will go in is still being explored and there may be a possible revision of the procedures manual.

Patricia Young asked on the status of the list of all the treatment facilities including current and actual capacity and how that was going. Dawn said that she will have that to the wastewater committee in the next couple of months. Amy offered that the IEPA can help collect that information through the NPDES permit process, as it is all in GIS.

Patty noted that this committee discussed many of these issues when the wastewater committee was formed, and that there has been a large gap in time, so she would like some more clarification on how the E&NR committee fits into this process. This committee has a lot of environmental related concerns but she noted that it feels like we've been left out of this process. She also asked what the public notice and participation process is.

Dawn reiterated that progress has been slow and the committee has only met four times, and that the committee is concentrating on getting familiar with the process. Dawn indicated that the process will move towards a more watershed planning approach as this is the direction that the IEPA is currently investigating with the Kishwaukee watershed pilot planning process that was presented to the committee recently. She will be asking the committee for their expertise on that process in the future. Two members of this working committee sit on the wastewater committee as it has been trying to define its role, Wally Van Buren and Patricia Young.

Dawn clarified changes that have been made to the public process. Level I applications that consist of 100 acres or more of agricultural land or are regional in scope used to have an automatic public hearing, however public hearings are now only done on request after the notice has been published in the local newspapers. All of the information is available on the web site including supporting documentation for each application. Patty added that no one reads the public notices in the newspaper and is not sure it replaces the previous public notice process of informing local stakeholders. Dawn said that she also sends out notices to affected parties within a mile and ½ radius of the application. Patty suggested that as the process seems to be moving toward a watershed based approach that watershed planning agencies and groups should be receiving notification of these and there seems to be a disjunct in communication. Cindy suggested that as it is a web based information sharing approach, how about creating an e-mail notice list? That approach might be less expensive than physical mailings. Dawn replied that there is an e-mail list in place however the packet doesn't go out in e-mail. Cindy asked if that could go to the Planning Liaisons too for dissemination.

Patricia Young said that if there are no requests the wastewater committee doesn't need to meet every month. Marty asked Dawn to add all the E&NR committee members to the e-mail notification list.

John wanted the minutes to reflect that this is a very important issue particularly with the future potential integration of point source discharges into watershed planning and as watershed are fundamental planning tools it is a high priority. It is a critical aspect to regional planning, is grounded in our green infrastructure, and plays a significant role in developing the footprints of municipalities as well as people understanding best management practices, and getting the 303d requirements fulfilled. This committee needs to take a serious approach to corrections to waterways.

Karla agreed with John and also pointed out that this committee had asked to be given the opportunity to review the new processes. She noted that FPA's are key to biodiversity and watershed health and asked if there is anything that prohibits input from this committee? She also asked if there is interest on the wastewater committee to consider these issues. Dawn said that the wastewater committee has been trying to understand their role, and she will bring these concerns to the attention of the wastewater committee. Ingrid asked how the meetings are scheduled. The wastewater committee meets immediately following the board meetings on a monthly basis.

Don added that CMAP has had a position advertised for a water resources engineer that has not been filled. We are interested in passing this on in case anyone knows of a possible candidate. Wally asked if the existing contracted firms would continue, and Don said that an in-house engineer would replace the consultants.

John asked what has happened since 2001 as that is the last figure on page 2 of the document Dawn handed out. Dawn said that there have been a lot of applications and reviews since 2001 and Kerry noted that they are listed in the Water Quality Activities reports that NIPC and CMAP have published for the IEPA. John asked who reviewed them and Dawn said they were reviewed by the NIPC water resources committee. To date the new wastewater committee has only reviewed 12. Dawn will update that number. On the website under the wastewater committee, there is a listing of all of the current applications. Patty asked about the general process and the criteria and wants to see that too. Dawn replied that the committee still follows the NIPC process. The criteria are still in place.

Ingrid, asked Dawn to come back next month and bring this FPA discussion to the agenda every month. John asked for the minutes from the meeting where we had the last discussion on FPA's to be available for review. Kerry said she will find them and send a notice out to the committee. Dawn, will bring the E&NR committee concerns to the wastewater committee. Amy wanted to make it clear that the wastewater committee makes a recommendation to the IEPA, not a decision. The IEPA takes that information to their decision making process. Patricia Young, stated that it is not a statutory requirement to bring this to this committee.

7.0 Regional Greenways & Trails Plan – Lori Heringa, CMAP Staff
Lori passed around the 1997 Plan and highlighted the major differences between this plan and the Green Infrastructure Vision which is primarily the level of detail and the

focus on trails. The Regional Greenways and Trails Plan identifies existing and proposed green corridors for habitat connectivity, stream protection and primarily regional trails. In 1992 it was the first such plan in the nation and won several awards, as did the update in 1997. There was a lot of regional participation in developing the plan and the region has used it well. CMAP is in the process of updating this plan. There have been meetings with county government, Conservation and Forest Preserve Districts, and other organizations on how to approach the revision to the plan. Staff has also surveyed the municipalities about what they want to see. Between 1992 and 1997 there were over 1000 miles of trails added due to the transportation bill, ISTEA, which included programs such as CMAQ and Enhancements funding that could be used for In 1997 stream corridors designated for protection were bicycle and trail facilities. added, according to the desires of the different county governments. Last November CMAP held a joint workshop with the Greenways and Trails Steering Committee and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Task Force identifying priorities, new facilities, built or proposed, and looking at where connections between counties could be made. Funding agencies have requested that the region identify priorities so they can be included within their selection criteria for awarding grants.

Patricia Young asked about local walking trails in the Forest Preserves and Lori responded that it wouldn't include walking paths, trails would have to be multi-use and explained that this is a planning map, not a user map. There is not the level of detail in the plan necessary for that, and there are a lot of regional bike maps in existence.

John Oldenburg asked if the map could reference in the legend where users could get specific maps so people could get the reference. He also asked if regional water trails were included and if there would be any capability in coding such as boat, canoe or kayak? Lori responded that there is a regional water trails map which will be re-printed and identifies which water trails are currently paddleable, and the type of experience level needed. There is a web site at www.openlands.org, which is interactive and provides specific information on each of the water trail segments..

Lori said that to update with watertrails we would likely be including that as an inset map, it would be in the plan but may not be in the main map with the same level of detail. John would like to see it integrated with the trails and feels it should be part of the network. It is important to see how it fits into the overall transportation plan. Patty Werner suggested an electronic map county wide for more detail and asked how CMAP defines regional other than multi-use. Is the greenway mapping a subset of the GIV map? How do they relate? Lori responded that the Greenways Plan is not necessarily a subset, since the GIV focuses on natural resource protection areas. The Greenways plan identifies specific corridors primarily for recreational activities. Lori will provide a chart to the committee showing the differences. Kerry will post it on the committee web page.

Marty added that GIS is perfect as people can print out their own areas rather than hard products but it has to be in a printable form. It can be interactive for the layers needed.

Karla said that she understands the concept behind a simpler map but that information can be lost and more interactive layered maps may be the answer. Trails need to be identified as to what is regionally significant about their biological values, not just their transportation uses. Trails need not be multiple use to be of regional significance. Karla asked Lori to please ask the committee to provide comments to assist with this.

It was noted that NIPC had a reputation as a great source of really good maps and hopefully CMAP will also have the same success. It was suggested that the map could be hyperlinked to a web mapping interface.

- 8.0 Lake Michigan Watershed Academy & Conference—Kerry Leigh, CMAP staff
 The Academy is the result of an ongoing multi-year collaboration with the USEPA Great
 Lakes National Program Office for promoting improved implementation of highpriority water quality goals for Lake Michigan. Kerry informed the committee about the
 conference and presented a powerpoint on the Academy and it's work to date. She will
 post this presentation on the web. There was some discussion about the content of the
 conference and Kerry encouraged the committee to attend.
- **9.0 Draft Climate Change Summit Report** Kerry Leigh, CMAP staff
 The draft climate change summit report was distributed and Kerry requested comments by Monday April 7th when it will be finalized and published on the web.

10.0 Discussion Items/Follow Up for Future Meetings

- Comprehensive & Regional look at surface freight movement through and within the region to include trucking, rail and barge to assess the environmental impacts.
- Paul Heltne brought up food supply & resources, protection of land and biofuels
 impact on food supply, also loss of agricultural set aside areas and accompanying
 open space. Exporting countries are exporting foods to the detriment of their
 populations and there are also security issues using local food planning as a tool. He
 would like to put this on the table for discussion.
- Paul noted that the CMAP economics committee sponsored a workshop on incentives for development. This committee might talk about this? Perhaps we should liaise with this committee? Two committees might be going in different directions and it might be useful to think about incentives in our area of concern. This workshop was sponsored by Commonwealth Edison. Possible suggestion for this committee.

Discussion ensued to the effect that to promote sustainability we need to have a liaison to the economic committee. There are host of incentives to a number of drivers that need to be integrated and linked toward a healthy region. Karla

volunteered to act as a liaison with the economic committee. Don reiterated that all meetings at CMAP are open and publicized. The concept of the planning and coordinating committees is for consistency. There is a process for that coordination layer above to address competing issues. John said he feels blind to the coordinating process and how that is going and he doesn't have any sense of feedback relative to that process. We will continue this discussion at the next meeting.

11.0 Other Business

12.0 Public Comment

This is an opportunity for comments from members of the audience. The amount of time available to speak will be at the chair's discretion.

13.0 Adjournment

Marty Jaffe moved to adjourn and Patricia Young seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Next Meeting Date: Wednesday, May 7th, 2008 at 9:30 am